

# COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

# of the County of Los Angeles

700 W. Main Street • Alhambra, CA 91801

Tel: 626.262.4511 • TDD: 626.943.3898 • www.lacdc.org

Gloria Molina Mark Ridley-Thomas Zev Yaroslavsky Don Knabe Michael D. Antonovich

Sean Rogan Executive Director

July 02, 2013

The Honorable Board of Commissioners Community Development Commission County of Los Angeles 383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Commissioners:

ADOPTED
Community Development Commission

V00400 V00

1-D July 2, 2013

SACHI A. HAMAI EXECUTIVE OFFICER

APPROVAL OF A LOAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TWENTY-FOUR UNITS OF AFFORDABLE AND SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING FOR FAMILIES IN UNINCORPORATED EAST LOS ANGELES (DISTRICT 1) (3 VOTE)

### SUBJECT

This letter recommends the allocation of HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) funds, County General Funds, Homeless Prevention Initiative - Homeless Services funds (HPI-HS), and Affordable Housing Funds for Whittier Place, a multifamily affordable housing development located at 4125-4131 Whittier Boulevard and 837 S. Bonnie Beach Place in unincorporated East Los Angeles.

### IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD:

- 1. Approve a loan to East Los Angeles Community Corporation (Developer) using \$1,165,425 in HOME funds, \$684,575 in County General Funds and \$945,000 in HPI-HS funds, in a total amount of up to \$2,795,000 for the development of Whittier Place (the Project), which has been selected through a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) issued by the Commission on November 20, 2012.
- 2. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to use up to an additional \$370,000 in Affordable Housing Funds, as needed, for unforeseen project costs.
- 3. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to accept and incorporate into the Commission's approved Fiscal Year 2013-2014 budget up to \$1,050,000 in HPI-HS funds allocated to the First Supervisorial District, and to retain \$105,000 (10%) for administrative costs.

#1-D JUL 2 2013

The Honorable Board of Supervisors 7/2/2013 Page 2

- 4. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to accept and incorporate \$1,165,425 in HOME funds and \$684,575 in County General Funds into the Commission's approved Fiscal Year 2013-2014 budget.
- 5. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to negotiate, execute, amend, and if required, terminate the Loan Agreement and all related documents with the Developer, including but not limited to documents to subordinate the loan to permitted construction and permanent financing, and any intergovernmental, interagency, or inter-creditor agreements necessary for the implementation of the Project, following approval as to form by County Counsel.
- 6. Acting as a responsible agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), certify that the Commission has considered the attached Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) for the Project, which was prepared by the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning as lead agency; and find that the Project will not cause a significant impact on the environment.

# PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The purpose of the recommended action is to approve the allocation of HOME funds, County General Funds, HPI-HS and Affordable Housing funds for the Project, which will provide 24 units of affordable housing in unincorporated East Los Angeles, including 15 units that will be reserved for special needs households.

### **FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING**

The total financing for the Project includes \$1,165,425 in HOME Funds, \$684,575 in County General Funds, and \$945,000 in Homeless Prevention Initiative Funds allocated to the First Supervisorial District.

HOME funds received from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development are administered by the Commission on behalf of the County of Los Angeles and are used for affordable housing located in unincorporated areas and 48 participating cities. County General Funds were allocated for the NOFA by the Board of Supervisors on October 23, 2012. The First Supervisorial District allocated HPI-HS funds for this Project.

A 13.2% Affordable Housing Fund contingency, in the amount of \$370,000, is also being set aside for unforeseen costs and construction overruns. The Commission will retain an administration fee of \$105,000 in HPI-HS funds (10% of the HPI-HS allocation). Funds will be incorporated into the Commission's approved Fiscal Year 2013-2014 budget as needed.

The final loan amount will be determined following completion of negotiations with the Developer and arrangements with other involved lenders. The loan will be evidenced by a Promissory Note and secured by a Deed of Trust, with the term of affordability enforced by a recorded Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions document.

### FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

On November 20, 2012, a NOFA was issued by the Commission, making available \$10,993,446 for the development of affordable rental housing. Eleven proposals were received by the December 20, 2012 NOFA deadline. Proposals were reviewed by technical consultants and an Independent Review Panel. Ten out of 11 proposals passed the threshold review phase and advanced to the

The Honorable Board of Supervisors 7/2/2013 Page 3

technical review phase. Only proposals scoring a minimum of 70% of the total points for each of the following categories, (1) Development Feasibility, (2) Supportive Services Plan and Budget and (3) Design, and a minimum of 70% of the total overall points, were considered for an award. Applicants were notified of the scoring results and given seven days to appeal individual scores for procedural or technical errors.

Because the need for affordable housing funding exceeded the amount allocated for this NOFA round, approximately \$3,934,425 in additional HOME funds were subsequently made available.

On February 26, 2013, your Board approved loans for eight of the 10 projects selected through the NOFA. The remaining two projects, Whittier Place and Live Oak Villas, did not yet have the required environmental documentation in place for Board approval. We are returning to your Board now to approve the loan and environmental documents for Whittier Place.

The Loan Agreement will be executed by the Executive Director following completion of negotiations and approval as to form by County Counsel. The Loan Agreement will incorporate affordability restrictions and provisions requiring the Developer to comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws. Funds will be disbursed once all financing is secured.

The Project will consist of 14 one-bedroom units and 10 two-bedroom units. These units will be affordable to low-income households earning no more than 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the Los Angeles-Long Beach Metropolitan Statistical Area, adjusted for family size, as established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Fifteen units will be reserved for homeless persons living with mental illness. Affordability requirements will remain in effect for 55 years. The development will also include one two-bedroom manager's unit, a community room, tot lot and a social service office.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION**

As a responsible agency, and in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the Commission reviewed the IS/ND prepared by the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning for the Whittier Place project, and determined that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment. The Commission's consideration of the IS/MND and filing of the Notice of Determination satisfy the State CEQA Guidelines as stated in Article 7, Section 15096.

An Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared for this project pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. This document describes the proposed project, evaluates the potential environmental effects, and describes the mitigation measures necessary to avoid potentially significant environmental effects from the project. Based on the conclusions and findings of the EA, the Certifying Official of the Community Development Commission approved a Finding of No Significant Impact on June 10, 2013. Following the required public and agency comment periods, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development will issue a Release of Funds for this project on or about June 26, 2013.

The environmental review record for this project is available for public review during regular business hours at the Commission's main office located at 700 W. Main Street in Alhambra.

# <u>IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)</u>

# #1-D JUL 2 2013

The Honorable Board of Supervisors 7/2/2013 Page 4

The requested actions will increase the supply of affordable housing for low-income and special needs households in the County of Los Angeles.

Respectfully submitted,

**SEAN ROGAN** 

**Executive Director** 

SR:ml

**Enclosures** 

# **Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)**

# County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



**Project title:** "Whittier Permanent Supportive Housing" / Project No. R2012-02368-(1) / Housing Permit No. 201200004; Conditional Use Permit No. 201200138; Environmental Assessment No. 201200249

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 91020

Contact Person and phone number: Maral Tashjian, 213-974-6435

Project sponsor's name and address: East LA Community Corporation

530 S. Boyle Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90033

Project location: 4125 Whittier Blvd, 4131 Whittier Blvd, and 837 Bonnie Beach Blvd, East Los Angeles

APN: 5239-021-037, 5239-021-038, and 5239-021-040 USGS Quad: Los Angeles

Gross Acreage: 0.4 Acre (17,259 sq. ft.)/0.378 Net Acres after alley dedication (16,509 sq. ft.)

General plan designation: N/A

**Community/Area wide Plan designation:** CC (Community Commercial) in the East Los Angeles Community Plan

**Zoning:** C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) in the Eastside Unite No. 1 Zoned District; East Los Angeles Community Standards District

**Description of project:** The Applicant, East LA Community Corporation, is proposing to develop the subject property with a 25-unit apartment complex of which 24 units are restricted to qualified affordable residents in the Very-Low Income category with area median incomes of 50 percent. There are 15 one-bedroom units and 10 two-bedroom units including one non-restricted manager's unit. The manager's unit is provided for compliance with funding authority requirements in order to accommodate the income level of a qualified manager. The proposed development is a three-story 36-foot in height garden style design 30,240 gross square feet of residential floor area. Amenities of the proposed development include a 3,925 square foot central courtyard with a 1,000 square foot recreation room.

The subject site is a 0.40 acre (prior to dedication) flat under-utilized infill parcel of land located on the north side of Whittier Blvd west of Bonnie Beach Place. The property has two street frontages, 45 feet along Bonnie Beach Place and 100 feet along Whittier Blvd. (The rear property line abuts an alley with 150 feet of frontage). The Bonnie Beach frontage will serve as the main vehicular entrance to the proposed subterranean parking garage. Main pedestrian access is from Whittier Blvd which leads to a lobby/elevator area, building management offices and community room.

**Surrounding land uses and setting:** The property is located on the north side of Whittier Blvd. west of Bonnie Beach Place with a land area of approximately 0.40 acres. The property is comprised of three individual parcels with 100 feet of combined frontage on Whittier Blvd and 45 feet of frontage on Bonnie Beach Place. The rear property line abuts a 20-foot alley with 150 feet of frontage. The property is currently

improved with an abandoned 1,950 square foot single story commercial building and vacant land. Whittier Blvd is an east-west oriented secondary highway with an existing street dedication of 80 feet and improved with sidewalk, curb and gutter. Bonnie Beach has an existing right of way dedication of 60 feet and is improved with sidewalk, curb and gutter. There is a metro bus stop at the corner of Whittier and Downey one block east of the subject site and another Metro bus stop at Whittier and Herbert two blocks to the west of the subject site.

The properties directly west of the subject site along Whittier Blvd are improved with commercial buildings in the C-3 zone. The properties east of the site are improved with commercial properties along Whittier Blvd. North of the subject property across the alley is zoned R-3 multi-family residential and a land use category of Medium Density. South of the subject site across Whittier Blvd the properties are improved with commercial uses and zoned C-3 with a Land Use Designation of Community Commercial.

# Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Public Agency Approval Required
Department of Public Works Building Permits

Sanitation District of Los Angeles County Sewer line Connection Permit

### Major projects in the area:

Project/Case No. Description and Status

N/A N/A

2/34

| Reviewing Agencies:  Responsible Agencies  None Regional Water Quality Control Board:  Los Angeles Region  Lahontan Region  Coastal Commission  Army Corps of Engineers          | Special Reviewing Agencies  ☐ None ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy ☐ National Parks ☐ National Forest ☐ Edwards Air Force Base ☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area ☐ LAUSD School District  | Regional Significance  None SCAG Criteria Air Quality Water Resources Santa Monica Mtns. Area  |
|--|--|--|
| Trustee Agencies  None State Dept. of Fish and Game State Dept. of Parks and Recreation State Lands Commission University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System) | County Reviewing Agencies  DPW:  - Land Development Division (Grading & Drainage)  - Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division  - Watershed Management Division (NPDES)  - Traffic and Lighting Division  - Environmental Programs Division  - Waterworks Division  - Sewer Maintenance Division | <ul> <li>➢ Fire Department</li> <li>- Forestry, Environmental Division</li> <li>-Planning Division</li> <li>- Land Development Unit</li> <li>- Health Hazmat</li> <li>☐ Sanitation District</li> <li>☒ Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise)</li> <li>☐ Sheriff Department</li> <li>☒ Parks and Recreation</li> <li>☐ Subdivision Committee</li> </ul> |

# **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

| The  | environmental factors ch   | ecke                            | d below would be potentially                                    | affected b                                | by this project.  |
|------|--|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
|      | Aesthetics   |                                 | Greenhouse Gas Emissions  | s   | Population/Housing  |
|      | Agriculture/Forest   |                                 | Hazards/Hazardous Materi  | ials                                      | Public Services   |
|      | Air Quality  |                                 | Hydrology/Water Quality   |   | Recreation  |
|      | Biological Resources   |                                 | Land Use/Planning   |   | Transportation/Traffic  |
|      | Cultural Resources   |                                 | Mineral Resources   |   | Utilities/Services  |
|      | Energy   |                                 | Noise   |   | Mandatory Findings  |
|      | Geology/Soils  |                                 |   |   | of Significance   |
|      | TERMINATION: (To be<br>the basis of this initial eva                         |                                 | apleted by the Lead Departmon:                                  | ent.)                                     |   |
|      |  |                                 | oject COULD NOT have a :<br><u>TION</u> will be prepared.       | significant                               | effect on the environment, and a  |
|      | will not be a significan   | nt eff                          | ect in this case because revisi                                 | ions in the                               | effect on the environment, there project have been made by or<br>/E DECLARATION will be           |
|      |  |                                 | oject MAY have a significant<br><u>PACT REPORT</u> is required. |   | the environment, and an   |
|      | significant unless miti<br>adequately analyzed in<br>addressed by mitigation | gated<br>n an e<br>on m<br>L IM | easures based on the earlier a                                  | t, but at le<br>applicable<br>analysis as |   |
|      | because all potentially NEGATIVE DECLA mitigated pursuant to                 | sign<br>ARA'<br>that            | TION pursuant to applicable                                     | inalyzed ac<br>standards<br>DECLAR        | dequately in an earlier EIR or<br>, and (b) have been avoided or<br>ATION, including revisions or |
| Sign | nature (Prepared by)   |                                 |   | Date                                      |   |
| Sign | nature (Approved by)   |                                 |   | Date                                      |   |

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be crossreferenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.
- 8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project's impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on: 1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project's inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and 2) worsening the project's impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).

### 1. AESTHETICS

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Would the project:  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?   |                                      |   |                                    | $\boxtimes$  |
| b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?  |                                      |   |                                    | $\boxtimes$  |
| c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?                  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Official State Scenic Highways are designated by the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans). According to CalTrans, "[t]he stated intent (Streets and Highway Code Section 260) of the California Scenic Highway Program is to protect and enhance California's natural beauty and to protect the social and economic values provided by the State's scenic resources" (State of California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, website: <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist3/departments/mtce/scenic.htm">http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist3/departments/mtce/scenic.htm</a>, accessed October 6, 2011). While there are numerous designated Scenic Highways across the state, the following have been designated in Los Angeles County: Angeles Crest Highway (Route 2) from just north of Interstate 210 to the Los Angeles/San Bernardino County Line, two segments of Mulholland Highway from Pacific Coast Highway to Kanan Dume Road and from west of Cornell road to east of Las Virgenes Road, and Malibu Canyon-Las Virgenes Highway from Pacific Coast Highway to Lost Hills Road.

In addition to scenic highways, unincorporated Los Angeles County identifies ridgelines of significant aesthetic value that are to be preserved in their current state. This preservation is accomplished by limiting the type and amount of development near them. These "Significant Ridgelines" ("Major Ridgelines" on Santa Catalina Island) are designated by the General Plan or applicable Area/Community Plan, Local Coastal Program, or Community Standards District.

Riding and hiking trails have been designated throughout unincorporated Los Angeles County. At present, there are officially adopted trails in the Antelope Valley, the Santa Clarita Valley, and the Santa Monica Mountains designated by the General Plan or applicable Area/Community Plan and Local Coastal Program.

The proposed project is not sited near any designated scenic highways, significant ridgeline, or other identified scenic resources, and would not result in any impacts related to having a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. (Source: State of California DOT, California Scenic Highway Program)

The proposed project is not sited near any designated riding or hiking trails, and would not result in any impacts related to having a substantial adverse effect on these resources. (Source: County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation, U.S. National Forest Service)

The proposed project is located in a fully developed area and is not sited near any trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, and undisturbed areas. The proposed structure is 36 feet high. The local community standards district permits up to 40 feet in height in the C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) Zone, so the proposed structure is consistent with the height standards of the local community plan. The applicant prepared shadow study which concluded that the shadows from the proposed building would not fall on any adjacent residences.

The proposed structure would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site, and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, or character.

### 2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact                         | No<br>Impact   |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                      |   |  |  |
|                                      |   |  |  |
|                                      |   |  |  |
|                                      |   |  |  |
|                                      |   |  |  |
|                                      | Significant   | Significant Potentially Impact with Significant Mitigation | Significant<br>Potentially Impact with Less Than<br>Significant Mitigation Significant |

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The proposed project is located in a fully developed, urbanized area, and is not sited near any farm or forest land. (Source: California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention Management Landscape Map and State of California / Department of Conservation / Division of Land Resource Protection / Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program)

The proposed project is zoned C-3 (Unlimited Commercial), in the East Los Angeles Community Standards District. The proposed project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, a Williamson Act contract, or with any existing zoning for forest land or timberland uses. The only Williamson Act contract lands in the County are located on Catalina Island and held by the Catalina Island Conservancy as set asides for open space and recreational purposes. Therefore, there are no agricultural Williamson Act contracts in the remainder of the unincorporated County. (Source: State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection / California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention Management Landscape Map)

### 3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Would the project:  | •                                    | •   | •                                  | •            |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
|   |                                      |   |                                    |              |

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The air pollutants that are regulated by the Federal and California Clean Air Acts fall under three categories, each of which are monitored and regulated:

- Criteria air pollutants;
- Toxic air contaminants (TACs); and,
- Global warming and ozone-depleting gases.

In 1970, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identified six "criteria" pollutants they found to be the most harmful to human health and welfare. They are:

- Ozone  $(O_3)$ ;
- Particulate Matter (PM);
- Carbon Monoxide (CO);
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>);
- Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>); and,
- Lead (Pb).

The Federal government and the State of California have established air quality standards designed to protect public health from these criteria pollutants. Among the federally identified criteria pollutants, the levels of ozone, particulate matter, and carbon monoxide in Los Angeles County continually exceed federal and state health standards and the County is considered a non-attainment area for these pollutants.

In response to the region's poor air quality, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) & the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) were created. The SCAQMD and the AVAQMD are responsible for monitoring air quality as well as planning, implementing, and enforcing programs designed to attain and maintain state and federal ambient air quality standards in the region. The SCAQMD implements a wide range of programs and regulations, most notably, the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The SCAQMD jurisdiction covers approximately 10,743 square-miles and includes all of Los Angeles County except for the Antelope Valley, which is covered by the Antelope AVAQMD.

Sensitive receptors are uses such as playgrounds, schools, senior citizen centers, hospitals or other uses that would be more highly impacted by poor air quality. AQMD Rule 402, which states "A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals."

The proposed project involves the construction of twenty-five (25) residential units. The proposed use will not result in any toxic emissions. As a result, no significant adverse impacts on sensitive receptors are anticipated to result from the proposed project's implementation. Project will implement best management practices for dust control during construction.

The proposed project's operation would not create any objectionable odors for the surrounding community. Odor nuisances are regulated by County Code.

# **4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

| Would the project:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USFWS?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the  |                                      |   |                                    |              |

Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County
Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive
Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County
Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state,
regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Biological resources are identified and protected through various federal, state, regional, and local laws and ordinances. The federal Endangered Species Act and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) state that animals and plants that are threatened with extinction or are in a significant decline will be protected and preserved. The State Department of Fish and Game created the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), which is a program that inventories the status and locations of rare plants and animals in California.

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act defines wetlands as "those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas."

The County's primary mechanism to conserve biological diversity is an identification tool and planning overlay called Significant Ecological Areas (SEA). SEAs are ecologically important land and water systems that are valuable as plant and/or animal communities, often integral to the preservation of threatened or endangered species, and conservation of biological diversity in the County. These areas also include nearly all of the wildlife corridors in the County, as well as oak woodlands and other unique and/or native trees.

The site and surrounding area is urbanized and fully developed. There are no sensitive natural communities present onsite or in the general vicinity, and none identified in the local plan or by state or federal agencies. There are no native trees, wildflower reserve areas oak trees, SEAs or SERAs present onsite or in the general vicinity. There are no candidate, sensitive or special status species at or near the project site. (Source: The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB))

### 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

| Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The project site is partially vacant and partially developed; there are no archaeological, paleontological, national or state-designated historic resources on the project site. The project site is located in an area that is urbanized and already developed; any human remains that may have existed on-site are likely to have been disturbed by previous development.

### 6. ENERGY

| Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance (L.A. County Code Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 20 and Title 21, § 21.24.440) or Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 21, § 21.24.430 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 21)? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?  |                                      |   | $\boxtimes$                        |              |

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Per Appendix F of CEQA guidelines, the goal of conserving energy implies decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. In 2008, the County adopted a Green Building Program to address these goals. Section 22.52.2100 of Title 22 (Los Angeles County Code) states that the purpose of the County's Green Building Program was to establish green building development standards for new projects with the intent to, conserve water; conserve energy, conserve natural resources, divert waste from landfills, minimize impacts to existing infrastructure, and promote a healthier environment. The Green Building Program includes Green-Building Standards, Low-Impact Development standards, and Drought Tolerant Landscaping requirements. In January 2011, the State of California adopted the *CAL*Green Building Code with mandatory measures that establish a minimum for green construction practices.

The proposed project would be built in compliance with the standards of the Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance and the State of California Green Code and would employ various energy saving elements such as occupancy sensors, daylighting, water efficient appliances/fixtures and drought tolerant plants as required by the code.

# 7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

| W/ 11.1   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Would the project:  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?  |                                      |   | $\boxtimes$                        |              |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| iv) Landslides?   |                                      |   |                                    | $\boxtimes$  |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area<br>Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or<br>hillside design standards in the County General Plan<br>Conservation and Open Space Element?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:  |                                      |   |                                    |              |

CC.041812

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act of 1972 prohibits the location of most structures for human occupancy across the traces of active faults, and lessens the impacts of fault rupture. The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act requires the California Geological Survey to prepare Seismic Hazard Zone Maps that show areas where earthquake induced liquefaction or landslides have historically occurred, or where there is a high potential for such occurrences. Liquefaction is a process by which water saturated granular soils transform from a solid to a liquid state during strong ground shaking. A landslide is a general term for a falling, sliding or flowing mass of soil, rocks, water and debris. The County General Plan prohibits new developments, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Act, within fault traces until a comprehensive geological study has been completed.

More than 50 percent of the unincorporated areas are comprised of hilly or mountainous terrain. The vast majority of hillside hazards include mud and debris flows, active deep seated landslides, hillside erosion, and man induced slope instability. These geologic hazards include artificially-saturated or rainfall saturated slopes, the erosion and undercutting of slopes, earthquake induced rock falls and shallow failures, and natural or artificial compaction of unstable ground. The General Plan Hillside Management Area (HMA) Ordinance regulates development in hillsides of 25 percent slope or greater to address these potential hazards.

The entirety of Southern California is seismically active; no project site is free from potential seismic impacts. Strong seismic ground shaking at the project site is correlated with the proximity to an active fault line that triggers an earthquake. The nearest fault trace/seismic area is located 5.5 miles to the east. The project site is not in the immediate vicinity of any earthquake faults and would therefore not be subject to strong seismic shaking as would structures in closer proximity to these fault areas. (Source: California Geological Survey (CGS) Seismic Hazard Zone Maps)

The project site is locate approx. 7,500 feet north of the nearest mapped liquefaction zone. The project site is not located within a hillside area and would not be subject to landslides. (Source: California Geological Survey (CGS) Landslide Maps / CGS Alquist-Priolo maps, 1974-2007)

Proposed on-site improvements would entail the development of the entire site for structures, pavement for the parking lot and driveways, sidewalks, and landscaped areas. If the project site was not already a disturbed due to previous developments (formerly a gas station), the proposed project would result in a significant loss of top soil. However, since the topsoil has already been disturbed, the proposed improvements would not create a significant impact in this respect. Erosion during construction phase would be controlled through the County's erosion and dust control regulations. Post-construction, the project would not contain any loose dirt, and would not create any erosion issues.

The project site was previously developed and would have small likelihood of containing unstable/expansive soils that would result in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. The project site is located in an urbanized area which is fully serviced by public utilities, including sewer system. The project does not propose any on-site wastewater treatment.

### 8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

| Would the project  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Would the project:  a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?                     |                                      |   |                                    |              |

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Temporary impacts would result during the construction phase of the proposed project. GHGs would be emitted by construction equipment and construction crew vehicles, however these emissions would be short-term and would be considered less than significant.

Long-term annual GHG emissions attributed to the proposed project would be generated from the increased vehicle trips generated by the project. However, these trips would be comparable to trips generated by a commercial use, such as those permitted in the subject property's underlying land use (MC – Major Commercial) and zoning (C-3, Unlimited Commercial) categories. The air quality impacts of the uses associated with this land use/zoning category were considered and analyzed during the land use planning process when the local area plan and zoning designations were developed. Additionally, the housing proposed would be set aside for low-income individuals and families who are more likely to use public transportation than single-occupancy vehicles, which would minimize the GHGs. Therefore the projected GHGs emissions at the site would be less than significant.

# 9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impaci |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:   |                                      |   |                                    |              |

| i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?                           |  |             |  |
|--|--|-------------|--|
| ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?                           |  |             |  |
| iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?  |  |             |  |
| iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard? |  |             |  |
| i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?             |  | $\boxtimes$ |  |

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Hazardous materials are generally defined as any material that because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or future hazard to human health and safety or to the environment, if released into the workplace or the environment (Health and Safety Code (H&SC), §25501(o)). The California Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC) is responsible for classifying hazardous materials in the state of California. Hazardous materials are commonly stored and used by a variety of businesses and are commonly encountered during construction activities.

DTSC oversees the cleanup of disposal and industrial sites that have resulted in contamination of soil and groundwater. In close cooperation with the United States Environmental Protection Agency, DTSC administers both state and federal hazardous waste programs including The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601–9675), the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and a number of other State and Federal bodies of law dealing with hazardous materials and the environment. The Envirostar database lists properties regulated by DTSC where extensive investigation and/or cleanup actions are planned or have been completed at permitted facilities and clean-up sites. No hazardous materials sites or properties listed in compliance with California Government Code, Section 65962.5 (e.g., Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System [CERCLIS], Resource Conservation and Recovery Act [RCRA]) are located on the project site. Any sites within the general vicinity are not likely to have contaminated the project site.

Projects in close proximity to airports are within the jurisdiction of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). The Regional Planning Commission meets in the capacity of the ALUC to consider projects requiring ALUC review and it makes a determination of the compatibility of the proposed project with the nearby airport.

The Office of Emergency Management is responsible for organizing and directing the preparedness efforts of the Emergency Management Organization of Los Angeles County. The OEM is the day-today Los Angeles County Operational Area coordinator for the County. The emergency response plan for the unincorporated areas is the Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (OAERP), which is prepared by OEM. The OAERP strengthens short and long-term emergency response and recovery capability, and

identifies emergency procedures and emergency management routes in the County. The disaster response plan is the County Local All Hazards Mitigation Plan.

The proposed project is a use which does not typically generate routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project would not generate accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste in the environment. The project site is not a hazardous materials site, and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. (Source: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public)

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. The nearest airport (LAX) is approximately nine (12) miles to the northeast. The project site is not located near a private airstrip. The project is not of a scale that would physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The project site is located in an urbanized area with full service from public utilities and infrastructure including water for firefighting purposes. The applicant has provided a letter indicating that the site is serviced by the California Water Service Company (Cal Water) and a fire flow test which would need to be deemed adequate by the Fire Department prior to project approval. The project site is located among residential and major commercial land uses. The proposed use would not be a significantly dangerous fire hazard related to the surrounding similar uses.

Facility maintenance activities for the project are likely to utilize hazardous materials in limited quantities, such as paints, thinners, cleaning solvents, fertilizers and pesticides. These hazardous materials would be stored on-site in a maintenance room. Site improvements would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through foreseeable upset and accident conditions that may release hazardous materials into the environment.

# 10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

| Would the project:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|   |                                      |   | <b>5</b>                           |              |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of<br>the site or area, including through the alteration of the<br>course of a stream or river, in a manner which would<br>result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| f) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| g) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development_Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52)?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| h) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| <ul><li>i) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high</li></ul>  |                                      |   |                                    |              |

| (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| j) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  |  |  |
| k) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain? |  |  |
| l) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?   |  |  |
| m) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?                                       |  |  |
| n) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

moundariaton) on in along provincity to surface water

Los Angeles County is split between two water quality regions: the Los Angeles Region and the Lahontan Region. Each regional board prepares and maintains a Basin Plan which identifies narrative and numerical water quality objectives to protect all beneficial uses of the waters of that region. The Basin Plans achieve the identified water quality objectives through implementation of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and by employing three strategies for addressing water quality issues: control of point source pollutants, control of nonpoint source pollutants, and remediation of existing contamination.

Point sources of pollutants are well-defined locations at which pollutants flow into water bodies (discharges from wastewater treatment plants and industrial sources, for example). These sources are controlled through regulatory systems including permitting under California's Waste Discharge Requirements and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program; permits are issued by the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board and may set discharge limitation or other discharge provisions.

Nonpoint sources of pollutants are typically derived from project site runoff caused by rain or irrigation and have been classified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) into one of the following categories: agriculture, urban runoff, construction, hydromodification, resource extraction, silviculture, and land disposal, according to the Basin Plan for the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. This type of pollution is not ideally suited to be addressed by the same regulatory mechanisms used to control point sources. Instead, California's Nonpoint Source Management Plan describes a three-tiered approach including the voluntary use of Best Management Practices, the regulatory enforcement of the use of Best Management Practices, and effluent limitations. Generally speaking, each Regional Water Quality Control Board implements the least restrictive tier until more stringent enforcement is necessary.

The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board addresses on-site drainage through its construction, industrial, and municipal permit programs. These permits require measures to minimize or prevent erosion

and reduce the volume of sediments and pollutants in a project's runoff and discharges based upon the size of the project site

During the construction phase of a proposed project, the pollutants of greatest concern are sediment, which may run off the project site due to site grading or other site preparation activities, and hydrocarbon or fossil fuel remnants from the construction equipment. Construction runoff is regulated by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit. This permit applies to all construction which disturbs an area of at least one acre.

The Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance is designed to promote sustainability and improve the County's watersheds by preserving drainage paths and natural water supplies in order to '...retain, detain, store, change the timing of, or filter stormwater or runoff.'

Areas of Special Biological Significance are "...those areas designated by the State Water Board as ocean areas requiring protection of species or biological communities to the extent that alteration of natural water quality is undesirable. All Areas of Special Biological Significance are also classified as a subset of STATE WATER QUALITY PROTECTION AREAS." Note that all of these areas are located off the coast of California and not within any inland water courses or bodies.

FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, prepares hydrological studies throughout the country, called Flood Insurance Studies, in order to identify areas that are prone to flooding. From the results of these studies, FEMA prepares Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) that are designed to geographically depict the location of areas prone to flooding for purposes of determining risk assessment for flood insurance. An area that has been designated a 100-year flood plain is considered likely to flood under the 100-year storm event.

Dam inundation areas are areas that have been identified as being potentially susceptible to flooding from a catastrophic failure of one or more of the dams in Los Angeles County. These areas were mapped in accordance with California Government Code Section 8589.5 and do not suggest with certainty that a particular plot of land would be inundated given a catastrophic dam failure.

A seiche is the sudden oscillation of water that occurs in an enclosed, landlocked body of water due to wind, earthquake, or other factors. A tsunami is an unusually large wave or set of waves that is triggered in most cases by a seaquake or an underwater volcanic eruption. A mudflow is flow consisting predominantly of earthen materials/soil and water.

The project site is located within the Los Angeles Region water quality control board (RWQCB) jurisdictional area. The proposed project would connect to the municipal wastewater system which is responsible for regulating and complying with all applicable wastewater treatment standards maintained by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements related to point sources. The proposed project is required to comply with the requirements of the Low-Impact Development Ordinance of Los Angeles County, as well as the requirements of the County's Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan (SUSMP) in order to control and minimize potentially polluted runoff. Because all projects are required to comply with these requirements in order to obtain construction permits and certificates of occupancy, the proposed project would not impact any nonpoint source.

The proposed project would rely on existing water conveyance infrastructure from an existing water district, not from a personal ground water well. The current retail provider for the project site is California Water Service Company (3316 West Beverly Boulevard, Montebello, CA 90640). The project would have water

usage comparable to surrounding commercial uses, which would not create a significant impact on the area aquifer's volume, or groundwater table level. (Source: <a href="http://gis.dpw.lacounty.gov/servicelocator/">http://gis.dpw.lacounty.gov/servicelocator/</a>)

With regards to groundwater recharge, and whether or not the proposed project would prevent surface water from infiltrating into subterranean aquifers, the project is currently entirely vacant with no impervious surfaces. The proposed project would create impervious surface throughout the majority of the property, however, the project is subject to the County's Low Impact Development standards which would require design features to keep ground recharge and runoff levels equal to pre-construction levels. The applicant has prepared a Drainage Concept which concludes that no drainage impacts would be created with the implementation of project design features to capture water on-site.

The project site is currently developed, and is located in an urbanized area. There are no natural streams or waterways located on or near the project site. The proposed improvements would not alter the course of a stream or river whose path travels across or near the project site, would not substantially increase erosion or siltation, and would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. As the proposed project would be required to comply with all requirements of the Low-Impact Development Ordinance for managing and minimizing the amount of runoff leaving the project site, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore the proposed project would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The project is subject to County construction codes which would regulate post-construction runoff and would comply with requirements for applicable stormwater NPDES permits as needed.

The project site and surrounding area is urbanized and there are no areas of special biological significance existing in proximity to the project site for the proposed project contribute any point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into. The proposed project would not use septic tanks or other private sewage disposal systems. Due to the project's use and scale, the project would not substantially degrade water quality.

The proposed project does not include a housing component within a 100-year flood hazard area. Regardless, the proposed project is not located within or in the vicinity of a 100-year flood hazard area.

The project site is located approximately 4,400 feet to the north of the nearest dam inundation area. The site is not located near the coast and therefore is not subject to tsunamis. The project site is not located within a landslide zone. Therefore the proposed structure will not be placed within any of these hazard areas.

### 11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

| Would the music et   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Would the project:   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| a) Physically divide an established community?   |                                      |   |                                    | $\boxtimes$  |
| b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| <ul><li>area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?</li><li>c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance</li></ul>  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| as applicable to the subject property?   |                                      |   |                                    | $\boxtimes$  |
| d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria,<br>Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or<br>other applicable land use criteria?                     |                                      |   |                                    |              |

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The proposed project includes twenty-five (25) affordable multi-family units and is surrounding mostly by developed properties. Thereby, the proposed project is an in-fill project within the surrounding community. The proposed project would develop an existing partially developed site, but would not disrupt or divide the existing pattern of development surrounding the project site. The proposed rental affordable housing project for very-low income individuals and families is compatible with other existing land uses along Whittier Boulevard. The apartments are a permitted use in the C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) Zone with a Conditional Use Permit. The project site is designated at CC (Community Commercial) in the East Los Angeles Community Plan, the project is also applying for a discretionary housing permit to allow for a density bonus under the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. As such, the proposed project will not physically divide an established community nor be inconsistent with the plan designations on the property and therefore there will be less than a significant impact. "The project would also not conflict with any Hillside Management Criteria or SEA Conformance Criteria as the project is not located within an SEA or Hillside Management Area.

### 12. MINERAL RESOURCES

| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact                         | No<br>Impact  |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
|                                      |   |  |   |
|                                      |   |  |   |
|                                      | Significant   | Significant Potentially Impact with Significant Mitigation | Significant Potentially Impact with Less Than Significant Mitigation Significant Impact Incorporated Impact |

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The County depends on the State of California's Geological Survey (State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology) to identify deposits of regionally- significant aggregate resources. These clusters or belts of mineral deposits are designated as Mineral Resources Zones (MRZ-2s), and there are four major MRZ-2s are designated in the County: the Little Rock Creek Fan, Soledad Production Area, Sun Valley Production Area, and Irwindale Production Area. The California Department of Conservation protects mineral resources to ensure adequate supplies for future production.

The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) was adopted to encourage the production and conservation of mineral resources, prevent or minimize adverse effects to the environment, and protect public health and safety. In addition, Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code (Part 9 of Chapter 22.56) requires that applicants of surface mining projects submit a Reclamation Plan prior to receiving a permit to mine, which must describe how the excavated site will ultimately be remediated and transformed into another use.

Small-scale oil production still occurs in many parts of the County, including the Baldwin Hills and the Santa Clarita Valley. The California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) permits and tracks each operating production well and natural gas storage well and ultimately monitors the decommissioning process.

The project site is not located in or within the vicinity of a known mineral resource area. (Source: General Plan 1980 Special Resources Map)

### **13. NOISE**

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Would the project result in:  | •                                    | •   | •                                  | •            |
| a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?                           |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The most common sources of noise in the project vicinity are transportation related noise sources, including automobiles and trucks. The project will be required to comply with LA County Noise standards. Operation of the proposed project is not expected to exceed the County's noise ordinance standards. Construction of the project would create a temporary period of noise to the surrounding neighborhood. However noise generated through construction would be regulated by Title 12, Chapter 12.08 of the County Code and be reduced to less than significant levels. The proposed project would not generate significant generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels from operation once completed. The construction of the project would create a temporary period of significant groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels for the adjacent properties. However noise generated through construction would comply with Title 12, Chapter 12.08 or the County Code. Compliance with these regulations would reduce groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels to less than significant levels. The project is not located within the vicinity of an airport land use planning area. The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

### 14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

| Would the project:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The proposed project would increase housing options and potentially population growth but not beyond the expected increase already projected. According to growth projections for the Unincorporated Los Angeles County area, the Gateway planning area population is expected to increase by 11 % by 2035 (from 129,247 to 149,829).

Currently, the site is developed with vacant commercial structures. No people would be displaced by the proposed project as there are none currently living at the site. The proposed project involves the construction of 25 new dwelling units. The LA County General Plan estimates an average of persons per household in the unincorporated area at 3.85 for multi-family housing. Using this rate, the proposed project would accommodate approximately 96.25 persons. According to the Los Angeles County 2008 Housing Element, the most recent Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allotment for the County Unincorporated areas is 57, 176 units from 2008 through 2014 of which 14,425 and 9,073 units shall be affordable to extremely very low and low income household respectively. The proposed project will account for less than 1% of the overall number of units needed to meet the projected affordable housing need of 57,176 units. Therefore, the population and housing impacts of the proposed project will be less than significant.

### 15. PUBLIC SERVICES

| a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Fire protection?  |                                      |   | $\boxtimes$                        |              |
| Sheriff protection?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| Schools?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| Parks?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| Libraries?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| Other public facilities?  |                                      |   | $\boxtimes$                        |              |

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Fire suppression services in unincorporated Los Angeles County are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD), which has 21 battalions providing services to the whole of the unincorporated County. Development in the unincorporated areas must comply with the requirements of the Fire Code (Title 32), which provides design standards for all development in the unincorporated County. Development must also comply with standards for response times between fire stations and the project site. These times are: 5 minutes or less for projects in urban areas, 8 minutes or less for projects in suburban areas, and 12 minutes or less for projects in rural areas.

Law enforcement services within the unincorporated Los Angeles County are provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department strives to maintain a service ratio of approximately one officer for every 1,000 residents within the communities it serves.

In Los Angeles County, parks are operated and maintained by the Department of Parks and Recreation. As of 2010, there were approximately 153 recreational facilities managed by the Department of Parks and Recreation totaling approximately 65,528 acres of recreation and open space. The Los Angeles County General Plan, Regional Recreation Areas Plan, provides the standard for the allocation of parkland in the unincorporated county. This standard is four acres of local parkland per 1,000 residents and six acres of regional parkland per 1,000 residents. For subdivision projects, the Quimby Act permits the County, by ordinance, to require the dedication of parkland or the payment of an in-lieu fee to achieve the parkland-to-population ratio sought in the General Plan. Further, as a condition of a zone change approval, General Plan amendment, or Specific Plan approval, the County may require the applicant pursuing the subdivision

to dedicate and/or improve land according to the following General Plan standards. This requirement is justified as long as an appropriate nexus between the proposed project and the dedication can be shown.

In the unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County, as well as in 50 of the 88 cities within the County, library services are provided by the County of Los Angeles Public Library. There are approximately 84 libraries operated by the County with roughly 7.5 million volumes in its book collection. The County of Los Angeles Public Library is a special district and is primarily funded by property taxes, but other funding mechanisms include a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District, developer impact fees, developer agreements, and a voter-approved special tax.

According to the Draft General Plan, the Library's planning guidelines specify that 2.75 library material items should be available per capita as well as 0.5 square feet of library space per capita. The Public Library also imposes a mitigation fee on residential development based on the cost estimation of providing the appropriate library facilities and services to each library planning area. The fees are as follows:

| Planning Area 1: Santa Clarita Valley per dwelling unit    | \$829.00 |
|--|----------|
| Planning Area 2: Antelope Valley per dwelling unit         | \$804.00 |
| Planning Area 3: West San Gabriel Valley per dwelling unit | \$839.00 |
| Planning Area 4: East San Gabriel Valley per dwelling unit | \$827.00 |
| Planning Area 5: Southeast per dwelling unit               | \$830.00 |
| Planning Area 6: Southwest per dwelling unit               | \$836.00 |
| Planning Area 7: Santa Monica Mountains per dwelling unit  | \$832.00 |

The project site is located in the Southeast Library Planning Area and therefore would require a \$20,750 (830 x 25) library mitigation fee.

### 16. RECREATION

| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?           | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | 4 | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |

# **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The Los Angeles County General Plan standard for the provision of parkland is four acres of local parkland per 1,000 residents of the population in the County's unincorporated areas, and six acres of regional parkland per 1,000 residents of the County's total population.

# 17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

| Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  |                                      |   |                                    |              |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?   |                                      |   |                                    |              |

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Traffic conditions are determined by using a system that measures the volume of traffic going through an intersection at a specific point in time relative to the intersection's maximum possible automobile throughput. This volume-to-capacity ratio is referred to as Level of Service (LOS) and ranges from the best-case scenario LOS A (free-flowing conditions) to the worst-case scenario LOS F (gridlock).

# 18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impa<br>ct |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Would the project:  | •                                    | •   | •                                  |                  |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?  |                                      |   |                                    |                  |
| b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?         |                                      |   |                                    |                  |
| c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                             |                                      |   |                                    |                  |
| d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?  |                                      |   |                                    |                  |
| e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |                                      |   |                                    |                  |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  |                                      |   |                                    |                  |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   |                                      |   |                                    |                  |

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The project site is located in an urbanized area which is fully serviced by public utilities, including sewer system. The project would connect to the County of Los Angeles Sanitation District sewer system and has obtained a will-serve letter from that department to that effect.

# 19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------|
| b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?   |                                      |   |                              |              |
| c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?   |                                      |   |                              |              |
| d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  |                                      |   |                              |              |